



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1995

No. 153

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, September 25, 1995)

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Here is an exciting Biblical promise to start our day:

"God is able to make all grace abound toward you, that you, always having all sufficiency in all things, may have an abundance for every good work".—II Corinthians 9:8.

Gracious Father, we thank You for Your amazing grace, Your unqualified love and forgiveness, and Your limitless strength that flows from Your heart into our hearts, filling up our diminished reserves. It is wonderful to know that You have chosen to be our God and have chosen us to belong first and foremost to You. We clarify our priorities and commit ourselves to seek first Your will and put that above all else. It is liberating to know that You will supply all we need, in all sufficiency, to discern and do what glorifies You. Grant us wisdom, Lord, for the decisions of this day.

We ask this not for our own personal success but for our beloved Nation. America deserves the very best from us today. Experience has taught us that You alone can empower us to be the dynamic leaders America needs. Fill us with a new passion for patriotism and fresh commitment for the responsibilities of leadership You have entrusted to us.

In the name of Jesus. Amen.

(Mr. ASHCROFT assumed the chair.)

HISTORIC WHITE HOUSE CEREMONY

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in the absence of other Senators in the Cham-

ber to debate the motion to proceed, and I know my colleagues will be arriving shortly, I think it appropriate to take a few minutes to comment on a historic ceremony which will take place at the White House at 12 noon today when the leaders of Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization are scheduled to sign a historic agreement.

I well recall the day, a little over 2 years ago, 2 years and 15 days ago, on September 13, 1993, when Prime Minister Rabin and PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat signed the initial agreement.

I must say that was a difficult day for me personally to watch Yasser Arafat honored at the White House after the long record of terrorism in which the PLO had engaged, including being implicated in the murder of the charge d'affaires at the United States embassy in the Sudan in 1974, the No. 2 United States official in that country, the hijacking of the *Achille Lauro* and the death of Mr. Klinghoffer, and many other acts of terrorism.

It seemed to me, as I think it did to most other Americans, that if Israel—the prime victim of the terrorist attacks by the PLO—through its leaders, Prime Minister Rabin and Foreign Minister Peres, were willing to shake hands with Yasser Arafat under those circumstances, that the United States should do what it could to facilitate the peace process. That is in deference to the leaders of that sovereign state.

I also recall when a letter was circulated on the floor of the U.S. Senate criticizing then Prime Minister Shamir for refusing to give land for peace. I was one who refused to sign that document on the proposition that U.S. Senators thousands of miles away from turmoil ought not to try to influence, let alone dictate, policies to the leaders of other sovereign states under those circumstances.

Now, after very protracted negotiations, we have Prime Minister Rabin

and Foreign Minister Peres and Chairman Arafat coming to the White House today to sign this historic agreement.

During the course of the past several weeks, Senator HANK BROWN of Colorado and I have had occasion to travel, including a trip to the Mideast to talk to the leaders of the nations there. After being there, Mr. President, I have a sense of guarded optimism about the future of peace in the Mideast.

I have traveled into that region extensively, going back to my first trip there in 1964. I do have very substantial reservations as to the adequacy of the PLO, the Palestinian response, and the response of Yasser Arafat to eliminate terrorism in the area.

Last year, Senator SHELBY and I introduced an amendment to the foreign operations bill which would have cut off United States aid if the PLO and Chairman Arafat did not take steps to curtail terrorism, and also to amend the PLO charter to eliminate the provisions which called for the destruction of Israel.

Frankly, Mr. President, I am not satisfied with what Chairman Arafat has done in either regard.

There has been the explanation, really an excuse, that they could not amend the charter because there was not a convening Palestinian authority at that time. Also, Chairman Arafat has said that he has taken certain action to declare those provisions null and void, but I think realistically much more could have been done.

Similarly, on the critical issue of stopping terrorism, I think a great deal more could have been done by Chairman Arafat on that important aspect.

Senator BROWN and I had an opportunity to meet with Chairman Arafat, and we asked him those questions very directly. We asked him why he did not do more to control Hamas, why he did not turn over individuals in the Palestinian group who were suspected of murder.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S 14433

When we went over a detailed list, for each one there was an explanation, really an excuse. Some of the acts of terrorism or murder occurred before the agreement was signed; in other cases, the appropriate Israeli officials had not filed the cases; in other cases, the papers were not precise.

We challenged Chairman Arafat on why he made speeches condemning terrorism in English and not in Arabic, and although it is plain he has made the speeches in English and not in Arabic, he said his English was not good and made the contention that he had, in fact, made the speeches in Arabic. He continues to make speeches which poison the atmosphere in which both parties seek a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

When pressed as to why he did not do more to control Hamas, he made an explanation that he himself was under threat of assassination from the Hamas who are in part directed from Syria.

Later in the conversation we discussed the Syrian Government and President Assad of Syria. Chairman Arafat said President Assad was a good friend of his, which led to the inevitable question: How could threats of terror and assassination come from the Hamas in Syria, when President Assad was a good friend? And Chairman Arafat, in an effort to smile, said, "Well, that's his style," confirming the great difficulties which are present in the Mideast.

Mr. President, I would like to make some additional comments about the historic meeting which is scheduled in less than an hour at the White House where a very significant agreement will be signed between the State of Israel and the Palestinians, the PLO.

I had commented earlier about a trip which Senator BROWN and I had made recently, including a stop in the Mideast. I have been a student of the issues there for many years, having made my first trip there in 1964, and in the last almost 15 years I have been a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of Appropriations and have done considerable work there and am cautiously optimistic about the prospects for peace in the Mideast.

It is a matter of grave concern, however, to note the continuous, horrible terrorist attacks on Israel which have been maintained, notwithstanding efforts of the Israeli Government to stop them and the pressure which the United States Government has tried to apply to Chairman Yasser Arafat and the PLO to contain those terrorist attacks.

Last year, Senator SHELBY and I offered an amendment, which was adopted, which conditioned United States aid to the Palestinians on the PLO making every conceivable effort to stop the terrorist attacks and also for the PLO to take out the language from the PLO charter calling for the destruction of Israel.

I considered renewing that kind of an issue in the legislation which was re-

cently passed in the foreign aid bill and decided not to press the matter at this time when the negotiations were so sensitive and so near agreement. But it is with considerable reservation that I see U.S. aid going forward. There are conditions that exist in law which call upon Chairman Arafat and the PLO to do their utmost to stop terrorist attacks. Nobody can ask them to be a guarantor or with absolute certainty to stop those terrorist attacks, but it is an issue as to whether they are making their maximum effort.

Frankly, I have doubts about this. To reiterate my earlier remarks, when Senator BROWN and I were in Israel, we visited with Chairman Arafat in the Gaza and asked him a number of very direct, pointed questions.

First, on the subject as to why he spoke in English and not in Arabic when he was denouncing terrorism. Chairman Arafat denied that he always spoke in English and said that his English was not good and said that he had spoken in Arabic. We then challenged him on a number of alleged murderers who were being protected by the PLO, as to why they were not turned over to Israel.

Chairman Arafat then deferred to one of his subordinates who raised one explanation, really, one excuse after another saying that some of the incidents had occurred prior to the time the agreement was signed and some the Israeli Government had not made the proper demands, the proper papers were not filed.

But it seems to me, Mr. President, that Chairman Arafat could do a great deal more than he is doing at the present time to restrain terrorism. I believe that the U.S. Congress, certainly the executive branch but also the Congress, must be alert on this very, very important issue.

On the issue about pressing Chairman Arafat about stopping terrorism for the Hamas, Chairman Arafat responded the Hamas had even threatened his life coming out of Syria or coming out of Iran. He later said that President Assad was a good friend, which led to the obvious question about how a good friend would be tolerating the Hamas which made threats on Arafat's life. Arafat said, well, that is President Assad, hardly an understandable explanation.

Also as part of our trip, Senator BROWN and I visited other countries, and wherever we went, we were struck with the greatest respect and admiration that the United States has held all around the world. There is enormous prestige, there is enormous power, there is enormous good will for the United States to be an intermediary and a broker for peace.

When Senator BROWN and I were in India, for example, we talked to Prime Minister Rao, who said that he would like to see the subcontinent nuclear free in the next 10 to 15 years.

The next day, I talked to President Benazir Bhutto and told her of the In-

dian Prime Minister's statement. She said, "Do you have it in writing?" She was very surprised.

We then wrote to the President telling him of our conversations and suggesting that he take the initiative to try to broker a peace between those two nations, where there is such enormous hostility.

I compliment President Clinton and Secretary of State Christopher for their leadership, which has been instrumental in bringing about the agreement which is scheduled to be signed within the hour at the White House and for their efforts and success in the agreement which was signed back on September 13, 1993. And I do believe that an activist President, who really exerted leadership on a worldwide basis, could do a great deal around the world, as, for example, in bringing the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan together.

I see that my distinguished colleague, Senator NICKLES, has come to the floor. I shall conclude, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent that a text of my report on the foreign travels, some of which I have commented about this morning, be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD; as follows:

SENATOR SPECTER'S REPORT ON FOREIGN TRAVEL

During the period of August 20-September 2, 1995, Senator Hank Brown and I traveled to ten countries in two weeks and met with heads of state of eight of these countries.

TAIWAN

We departed on August 20, 1995 and arrived in Taipei, Taiwan on August 22, 1995, after having crossed the international date line. At 5:00 pm, we had a lengthy meeting with Taiwan's President Lee Teng-hui. We discussed President Lee's private visit to the United States to visit his alma mater, Cornell University from June 6-10, 1995, and the People's Republic of China's (PRC's) retaliation for that visit by conducting live missile tests wherein the PRC fired 6 missiles targeted 85 miles north of Taiwan's coast—2 missiles from Manchuria, 2 missiles from northwest China and 2 missiles from Central China.

President Lee also detailed the "One China" policy, under which both Taiwan and the PRC believe that there is only one China. Taiwan and the PRC differ, however, in that the PRC insists Taiwan is part of China and that there can be two systems operating in one country. Taiwan, on the other hand, has taken the position, through its national unification guidelines, that the PRC must realize certain political and economic reforms before the unification may occur.

We also discussed our concerns regarding the current trade imbalance between Taiwan and the U.S. President Lee assured us that he has been working hard to reduce the trade imbalance. He noted that his efforts have led to a drop in the trade deficit from \$16.5 billion to \$6 billion and that he personally is committed to reducing the deficit by at least 10 percent per year by expanding Taiwanese purchases of U.S. exports and reducing tariffs on imported U.S. products.

On the evening of August 22nd, we had a working dinner with Taiwanese Foreign Minister and former Ambassador to the United

States Frederick F. Chien. We discussed Taiwan's political reforms and its movement toward freedom of the press, open elections and democratization. We also discussed at greater length the One China policy and Taiwan's diplomatic and economic relations with the PRC.

Dr. Lyushun Shen, the Director of Public Affairs at the Taipei Education and Cultural Representatives Office in Washington, D.C., noted that the PRC's recent missile firings have had a strong impact on Taiwan's stock market, with the index dropping 200 points the first day and 1000 points overall, from 5500 to 4500.

CAMBODIA

On Wednesday, August 23rd, we departed Taipei at 6:45 am. We arrived in Phnom Penh, Cambodia for an early meeting with King Norodom Sihanouk. The King detailed his image of the future of Cambodia, including his assessment that every Cambodian is determined, and he is personally committed, to ensure the continuation of a liberal democracy, along with a multiparty system and free press, coupled with a free market economy.

We spoke to King Sihanouk regarding the importance of protecting human rights. In response, he observed that human rights groups are active in defending their rights, without interference from the government. Further, he stated that when the 1st Prime Minister did not want to allow the United Nations to maintain an office in Cambodia for human rights, the King insisted, and succeeded in allowing the office to remain open.

I asked King Sihanouk about the continued threat of the Khmer Rouge and Pol Pot to the security and stability of Cambodia. He dismissed the Khmer Rouge as a small movement of communist extremists centered near the Thailand border. According to the King, the Khmer Rouge has been severely decimated by 10,000 defections over the last several years, leaving primarily a small band of hardliners, totalling no more than 6,000.

We also raised our concerns about the expulsion of Sam Rainsy from Parliament because of his criticisms of the government. The King responded that party issues are private issues between each Member of Parliament (MP) and the party on which they stood for election. Since Rainsy ceased to represent and support the party platform on which he was elected, the King reasoned, he could be removed from the party. Upon such removal, he continued, Rainsy could then be removed from Parliament because he no longer was a party member.

After our meeting with King Sihanouk, we met with Cambodia's 2nd Prime Minister Hun Sen, who is currently in a power sharing relationship with the 1st Prime Minister Prince Ranariddh Sihanouk. We discussed with Mr. Sen whether he has any differences with the 1st Prime Minister and whether he plans to challenge the 1st Prime Minister in the upcoming elections in 1998. Mr. Sen acknowledged that he and the 1st Prime Minister are from different political parties, but that the two parties will join together as allies in the upcoming elections rather than fielding opposing slates of candidates, and that Mr. Sen would not challenge the 1st Prime Minister for the position of 1st Prime Minister.

Mr. Sen expounded at some length about the benefit of a political alliance before and after an election rather than a divisive fight before an election and an alliance afterwards. Such a system, Mr. Sen argued, is the most secure and the most democratic. We suggested that when opposite parties combine forces, it eliminates competition and the voters are not given a choice of differing platforms. Mr. Sen responded that his main

objective is political stability and that the Cambodian system does not end pluralism, but instead, ensures pluralism with cooperation. He also noted that in a country without the long tradition of democracy and the mechanisms for elections that we enjoy in the U.S., if the two main parties did not cooperate, it would be impossible to even install a ballot box at the polls, much less conduct a free election.

Mr. Sen further opined that the Cambodian government is not like the Democrats and Republicans in Congress. If the Cambodian People's Party (CPP) withdrew from its alliance with the National United Front for an Independent, Neutral, Peaceful and Cooperative Cambodia (FUNCINPEC), the government would collapse, and conversely, if the FUNCINPEC party withdrew from the alliance the government would also collapse. So, according to Mr. Sen, in Cambodia the two top political parties must cooperate together to ensure that democracy continues.

After our meeting with Mr. Sen, we met briefly with several prominent representatives of human rights organizations in Cambodia, along with some Cambodian elected officials. The focus of the discussion was on the expulsion of Rainsy from Parliament and the concerns of those who fear that the government may oust them in a like fashion from Parliament for criticism of the government.

Although Cambodia claims to have adopted the German model of Parliamentary government, the human rights leaders noted that under German Parliamentary Rules, a Member of Parliament may only be expelled from the party. The MP cannot be expelled from Parliament even if that MP was elected on a party slate. Instead that MP would hold the seat until the next elections at which time the party could select a different individual as the designated MP for that area.

We had a country team briefing by embassy staff about Cambodia's political and economic stability. We were briefed on the Khmer Rouge insurgency and the limited threat posed by the Khmer Rouge in Phnom Penh. It was noted that defections in their ranks have reduced the Khmer Rouge to 6,000-7,000 individuals, down dramatically from 30,000-40,000 in the mid 1970's.

We asked why the U.S. should continue its annual aid to Cambodia, which currently totals \$40 million. The response was that U.S. aid, which primarily takes the form of humanitarian assistance, medical training and military training in joint exercises, all help to strengthen democratic forces in Cambodia and lessen the need for larger expenditures by limiting the danger of confrontation in the future. Robert Porter, the U.S. Deputy Chief of Mission also observed that joint training exercises help enhance U.S. military readiness by giving U.S. personnel on-site training in tropical climates, conditions and cultures.

We also met with Prince Ranariddh Norodom, the 1st Prime Minister (and son of King Sihanouk), and expressed our interest in seeing an improvement in the movement toward democracy and free elections. In particular, we discussed the creation of a Constitutional Council in Cambodia to review all laws and determine whether they conform with the Cambodian Constitution. The 1st Prime Minister expressed an interest in finalizing the Constitutional Council due to the fact that the National Assembly had already passed 40 laws which have not yet been adjudged Constitutional.

When pressed on the importance of ensuring constitutional and democratic governance, the 1st Prime Minister responded that Cambodia is a constitutional government which was supported by a large majority on election day. He further noted, however, that

the current government must be compared to the previous autocratic and ruthless regime of Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge. In addition, with the small but continued threat of the Khmer Rouge, the current government must be particularly sensitive to the importance of internal security.

We raised our concerns about the expulsion of MP Rainsy from Parliament and the implication of this expulsion on the growth of democracy in Cambodia. He emphasized that Cambodia needs political stability now, with the two parties united together. If someone wants to oppose the party and the government then that party should leave the party and form their own party.

On the issue of freedom of the press, the 1st Prime Minister stated that freedom of the press in Cambodia is not bad, particularly when compared to press freedoms in countries in the region, such as Thailand, Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia—and those countries do not have comparable security problems. He said currently, there are over 50 newspapers that have full freedom to criticize the government and many actively oppose the government, all without criminal penalties. The 1st Prime Minister noted ruefully that many of the cartoonists seem to take great pleasure in lampooning him.

The 1st Prime Minister then discussed his strategy for reducing poverty and thus encouraging the Khmer Rouge to leave Pol Pot and join the Cambodian government through improvements in education, agriculture and rural roads.

MYANMAR

We departed Cambodia and arrived in Yangon, Myanmar, where we were briefed by U.S. embassy personnel, led by Charge d'Affaires Marilyn Meyers. There is currently no U.S. ambassador to Myanmar, nor has there been since December, 1990, when the U.S. withdrew its ambassador to protest the government's refusal to honor the results of a free election.

We were briefed on the poor condition of democracy and human rights in Myanmar. In the 1990 elections, the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) refused to honor the results of a landslide electoral victory by the National League for Democracy (NLD) led by Aung San Suu Kyi. In that election, opposition parties won 80% of the seats in Parliament.

We were also briefed on the tremendous problem with narcotics trafficking in Myanmar. Our reports indicate that over 60% of the heroin passing through the "golden triangle" of southeast Asia passes through Burma on its way to distribution in the United States and across the world. The government has apparently sought to combat the narcotics trade by limited incursions against known drug lords. The U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) has provided training and funds to the government to assist it in its efforts at detection and eradication of narcotics.

After the country team briefing, we met with Lt. General Kim Nyuet of the SLORC. We conveyed our concerns over the imprisonment of Aung San Suu Kyi and the lack of democracy in Myanmar. General Nyuet expounded at length about Myanmar's unique characteristics, noting that the country is comprised of 135 different races of people, with different customs, languages and religions.

The General claimed that the 1990 elections were marred by uprisings and violence—including beheadings in center city Yangon—which resulted in a breakdown of the government machinery. As a result of this breakdown and the ensuing public dissatisfaction, Nyuet argued, there emerged a need for law and order as the first priority for keeping the country together.

We emphasized to General Nyuet the importance of human rights as the linchpin to warmer relations between Myanmar and the U.S., and advised the General that Congress is considering an amendment by Senator McConnell that would impose stringent sanctions against Myanmar until there is concrete improvement in democracy and human rights. In particular, I advised him that the U.S. will closely monitor progress on a Constitutional Convention and the release of all political detainees. When I asked him whether Aung San Suu Kyi would be named to participate in the Convention, he shrugged and said that all the delegates had already been chosen.

Although I applauded his recent release of 1991 Nobel Peace Prize laureate Aung San Suu Kyi, we advised General Nyuet that SLORC can and should remove its remaining restrictions on Aung San Suu Kyi, including the monitoring of her meetings and harassment and intimidation of individuals with whom she meets. I also urged him to reconsider his suggestion that Aung San Suu Kyi would not be allowed to be a delegate to the Constitutional Convention.

The next morning, August 25th, we had the privilege of meeting Aung San Suu Kyi for breakfast. She was a very warm, dynamic, and impressive person who conveyed an intense desire for democratic reforms and improvements in human rights in Myanmar.

She spoke passionately and poetically about the importance of dialog as the means for resolving conflict peacefully. Every situation of conflict ends in dialog, she noted, so intelligent people should be able to go directly to dialog without the need for devastation. Dialog is inevitable, and the sooner this dialog begins, the better.

She also discussed the nearly 6 years she spent under house arrest without any charges and no trial and the similar treatment accorded to many of her fellow country men and women.

INDIA

Later that afternoon, we flew to New Delhi, where we met with Foreign Minister Pranab Mukherjee, India's Ambassador to the United States S.S. Ray, and other Indian officials for dinner at the Foreign Minister's residence.

The main focus of our discussions was the relationship between India and Pakistan. In particular, we discussed the tremendous tensions between these two countries over the situation in Kashmir, terrorism and nuclear weapons. Our hosts spoke emphatically about the need to maintain sanctions against Pakistan for the purchase of missile component parts from China and the importance of supporting the Pressler amendment which would keep these sanctions in place. They noted that any movement away from these sanctions, particularly any legislation that would allow Pakistan to receive military equipment, would send the wrong signal and damage the relationship between the U.S. and India.

We related to the Indian officials Aung San Suu Kyi's discussion of the importance and inevitability of dialog as a means to resolve all conflicts, and we asked them if the U.S. could do anything to facilitate greater dialog between India and Pakistan. They expressed an interest in achieving an agreement that would enable both sides to lessen their expenditures on border troops and military equipment and that would lessen the growing tension between the two countries on issues of nuclear proliferation and first strike limitations.

The next morning, August 26th, we met privately with India's Prime Minister Narasimha Rao. He expressed a deep concern about India's arms race with Pakistan and

noted that India has taken an important step by decreasing its military budget.

He also stated that he would be very interested in negotiations which would lead to the elimination of any nuclear weapons on the Indian subcontinent within ten or fifteen years, including renouncing the first strike use of such weapons. His interest in such negotiations with Pakistan would cover bilateral talks or would encompass a regional conference including participation by the United States, China and Russia, in addition to India and Pakistan. When I pressed him on whether his proposal would include international inspections, he said that he did not want to get involved in details, but that India has experts working on all details on all related matters.

PAKISTAN

On August 27th, we departed India and flew to Islamabad, Pakistan, where we had a meeting and subsequent dinner with President Farooq Leghari. We discussed the importance of establishing peace in the region by addressing the problems of terrorism and nuclear containment.

On the issue of terrorism, we expressed our concern about the role of Iran in fostering revolutionary and religious fervor, manifesting themselves in acts of terrorism. President Leghari stated his belief that Iran still contains extremist elements but that the voices of moderation predominate. He noted that opening trade and dialog with Iran will help to reduce its insecurity and bring it back into international fold.

The next morning, August 28th, we had breakfast with Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto. She expressed genuine surprise over the content of our discussions with India Prime Minister Rao with respect to an agreement to dismantle all nuclear weapons on the Indian subcontinent within 10 to 15 years. She stated that this was the first time that she had heard any such commitment from India and she asked if we could get Mr. Rao to put his agreement in writing.

When we pressed her on the importance of dialog between India and Pakistan, and asked her when the last time was that she spoke with India Prime Minister Rao, she said that she had not spoken with him since she became Prime Minister. She noted that she had attempted to begin a dialog at the Foreign Secretary level, but that the talks were disbanded when India initiated military hostilities against Pakistan. She also related the perception in Pakistan that she is soft on India precisely because she was seeking a dialog with India.

We suggested to Prime Minister Bhutto that the U.S. would be willing to serve as an intermediary between the two countries to facilitate this dialog, particularly in the area of nuclear containment. Ms. Bhutto responded that since Pakistan is the one targeted by India's missiles, and because Pakistan lacks the capability to launch a 1st strike, it is more appropriate for India to renounce a first strike option unilaterally.

I wrote a letter to President Clinton summarizing our meetings with Prime Ministers Rao and Bhutto and suggesting that it would be very productive for the United States to initiate and broker discussions between India and Pakistan regarding nuclear weapons and missile delivery systems. A copy of this letter is attached to this report.

On the issue of Pakistan's purchase of M-11 missile components from China, Ms. Bhutto denied that Pakistan had ever purchased or possessed such missiles. She noted that Pakistan would not be under such pressure to develop nuclear capabilities if India had not acquired such capabilities, and that Pakistan only began developing its nuclear program in 1974, after India detonated its first nuclear test.

She also questioned the continuing U.S. sanctions against Pakistan for the purchase of these components, noting that the U.S. had originally levied sanctions against both China and Pakistan for the sale and subsequently removed the sanctions only from China.

Ms. Bhutto agreed with our suggestion that the U.S. could perform a critical role as a third party mediator between India and Pakistan on nuclear as well as conventional weapons. She remarked that there has never been an understanding between India and Pakistan unless a third party has mediated, and she stated her belief that Prime Minister Rao would be the ideal person to participate in such negotiations because he is now in a position to be a statesman.

At a press briefing, we commented on our discussions with the Prime Minister of India and Pakistan on possible discussions to remove the nuclear threat from the subcontinent.

Shortly thereafter, the Indian government through its embassy in Washington, D.C. sought to deny Prime Minister Rao's statements on negotiations on nuclear disarmament by claiming that our meeting covered only the 1988 Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan on nuclear disarmament. We did discuss the issues set forth above and we did not discuss the Gandhi Action Plan.

SYRIA

We departed Islamabad on August 28th for Damascus, Syria. The next morning, we met with Foreign Minister Farouk al-Sharah. Our discussion with Sharah had barely begun when he complained about the nuclear threat posed by Israel.

I asked Mr. Sharah if Syria fears that Israel will use nuclear weapons against Syria. Interestingly, Mr. Sharah acknowledged his concern, but noted that Israel would not likely detonate a nuclear device because any such use, in a region where the nations are so close together, would affect Israelis as well as Syrians.

When asked if Syria had developed nuclear capabilities, Mr. Sharah responded that it is important that nations develop nuclear capabilities for peaceful uses and acknowledged that Syria is moving in this direction, while remaining a party to the Non Proliferation Treaty and cooperating with international inspections.

We also discussed that status of peace talks between Syria and Israel and the importance of dialog between the two nations. Mr. Sharah expressed his concern over the deadlocked talks, and opined that Israeli Prime Minister Rabin may be feeling electoral pressure such that an agreement may be possible only after the Israeli elections. Although the two sides have not completed agreement on any components of the peace talks, there was agreement on the principles of security arrangements between the two nations.

On the issue of the Golan Heights, Mr. Sharah stated his belief that if the Israelis did not intend to withdraw from the Golan Heights, then they would not have entered the peace discussions to begin with, and that a full peace can be achieved only by a full withdrawal from the Golan.

With respect to terrorism, we discussed the importance of ending support for terrorism. Mr. Shara denied any complicity in the acts of terrorism by Hamas and the Jezbollah, or any training by these groups in Syria.

We also discussed Saddam Hussein and the situation in Iraq. Mr. Sharah noted that King Hussein's recent speech in which he condemned the Iraqi dictator apparently had been favorably received by Saddam, since the speech was transmitted in its entirety on Iraqi television. When I asked Mr. Sharah if

he believed it is possible to bring Saddam back into the family of nations, he responded that he did not believe it is possible.

After meeting with Mr. Sharah, we had a very instructive meeting with President Hafiz al-Asad. He stated there will be peace between Syria and Israel and advised us not to be too impatient about the current peace negotiations. He noted that he thinks Mr. Rabin should move forward on these peace talks and accomplish something before the elections because of his platform for peace.

ISRAEL

We left Damascus and flew to Tel Aviv on the evening of August 29th. The next morning, we had several meetings with Israeli officials, commencing with a breakfast meeting with Yaacov Frenkel, the Governor of the Bank of Israel, in which we discussed Israel's efforts to expand trade and tourism between Israel and its Arab neighbors. We also discussed the importance of U.S. aid on Israel's economy. Mr. Frenkel remarked that this aid is critical to Israel because of the statement it makes to the Israeli people about the American government's continued support of Israel and because of Israel's costs of pursuing peace and financing the tremendous inflow of immigrants, which total 80,000 to 90,000 yearly.

We were then briefed by U.S. Ambassador Martin Indyk and his staff on the status of Israeli-Syria peace talks. The U.S. had previously set the groundwork for the peace talks when our Secretary of State announced an agreement that Israel and Syria would have meetings in three stages; first, between the Chiefs of Staff; second, between senior military staff, and finally between the heads of state. After the 1st stage, but before the meeting of the military officers, President Asad changed his mind and stated that there must 1st be agreement on the issue of Early Warning systems before the talks could proceed.

We were advised that at this point, then, the Israeli government has turned its attention to its peace talks with the PLO, and away from the Syrian negotiations. The negotiations with the Palestinians have moved at a rapid pace, with the agreement 90% complete.

We then had lunch with key Palestinian leaders, including Faisal Hussein and Hanan Ashrawi, to discuss their perspectives on the peace talks with Israel. They expressed optimism about the pace of the negotiations. However, they also expressed their deep concerns about the situation in Jerusalem and the rights of Arabs and Palestinians in the city. They suggested that Jerusalem become the capitol of two states, with the provision that Jerusalem would be under the exclusive sovereignty of NO state.

We also discussed the problem of terrorism. Mr. Hussein stated that the best way to stop terrorism is to stop factors which lead to terrorism—by allowing people greater control over their lands. He also stated his belief that the Israelis cannot keep 400,000 Palestinians hostage in Hebron to resolution of the peace process, and that there must be prompt resolution of the situation in Hebron.

Later on the afternoon of August 30th, we met with former Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir. We discussed the status of the current peace talks with the PLO and his concerns over terrorism and internal security. He noted pointedly that the difference between the peace talks between Israel and Egypt and the talks with the Palestinians is that the peace talks with the Egyptians were with an external entity, whereas the negotiations with the Palestinians are internal, insofar as they involve people currently living in Israel.

On Wednesday evening we met with Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. In our meeting with Mr. Rabin, he declared his dedication to utilizing this unique moment in history, which began with the dismantlement of the former Soviet Union, to bring about peace in the Middle East. He noted in particular the advantage to removal of the Soviet umbrella over the heads of Arab leaders.

In response to my question on the peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians, Prime Minister Rabin expressed optimism about the prospects for peace. He noted that he wishes to see Israel as a Jewish state, without bilateral governance. However, Mr. Rabin clarified that he does not see Israel as a Jewish state if racism will be the governing policy. Instead, he prefers peace within Israel with rights for Palestinians. As part of this peace, Prime Minister Rabin talked of new priorities, under which Israel will no longer expend resources on settlement of the West Bank, where only 3% of Israeli Jews live.

I asked him if there is any way to control terrorism. He commented first about the recent bus bombing, noting that although the bombing was carried out by Hamas, it was done in an area under Israeli control. The elements supporting this terrorism, he continued, are seeking to bring down the Israeli Labor government because the peace process will certainly come to an end under a Likud government. According to Prime Minister Rabin, many of these same forces of extremism are seeking to assassinate PLO Chairman Yassir Arafat because of his overtures to Israel. The acts of terrorism are difficult to control—over 70% of these terrorist acts since 1994 have been carried out by suicide missions which are virtually impossible to prevent.

Regarding peace discussions with Syria, Mr. Rabin stated that Israel stands ready to negotiate, but that the Syrians want the U.S. to remain involved as a third party mediator to these talks. He expressed his concern over the breakdown of talks over the issue of Early Warning systems.

The next morning, August 31st, we had breakfast with Israeli opposition party leader Benjamin Netanyahu. In response to my question about whether the PLO is complying with the conditions for U.S. aid, he stated that Arafat is not doing all that he can to stamp out terrorism. In particular, Mr. Netanyahu pointed to speeches by Arafat in which he has said that Palestinians should be patient but that the ultimate way is the way of a "Jihad". He further noted that Arafat has taken minor steps to crack down on terrorists, but that he has refused to extradite known terrorists in his own police force.

When asked if reports were true that he was willing to meet with Arafat, Mr. Netanyahu said that these reports were not true. He said he would furnish us with a list of known terrorists that are wanted for murder, whom Arafat has refused to extradite to Israel, so that I could bring up these names with Arafat personally. In particular, he highlighted the Abu-Sita cousins, who are suspects in the murder of Uri Megidish. According to Mr. Netanyahu, these individuals are currently serving in the Palestinian intelligence service and the Palestinians have refused repeated requests to turn them over to Israeli authorities for trial.

After meeting with Mr. Netanyahu, we spoke with Israeli President Ezer Weitzman about the importance of peace with the Palestinians and the Syrians. Mr. Weitzman agreed that, in general, a peace agreement between Israel Syria would be good for both nations.

We asked President Weitzman whether the U.S. should continue giving aid to the PLO if

Arafat is not complying with the conditions attached to that aid. He responded that the U.S. should stick to the requirements set forth in the law and force Arafat to comply with the conditions attached to that aid. Mr. Weitzman also commented that he would not go to the U.S. to sign an interim agreement between Israel and the PLO because in its current form this agreement is not the final agreement.

After meeting with President Weitzman, we drove to Gaza for a meeting with PLO Chairman Yassir Arafat. Chairman Arafat emphasized again and again the importance of a resolution of the situations in Hebron and Jerusalem as critical factors in ensuring peace and the success of the peace talks with Israel.

We asked Arafat if it is possible for the PLO to exert more pressure on Hamas to renounce acts of terror. He responded that pressure must be brought to bear on Iran and Syria. He noted, however, that the PLO has stopped 11 attempted acts of terror, with the latest coming just 2 days prior to our meeting. He also noted that as a result of his peace efforts, he has received death threats by Hamas groups operating out of Syria.

In response to allegations that he only condemns terrorism when speaking in English, but not Arabic, Arafat denied the charge, noting that since his English is not good, he typically speaks in Arabic, and that he had condemned terrorism in Arabic on numerous occasions, including at the University. Arafat explained that his speeches in Arabic are being misunderstood, and that when he calls for a "Jihad" he is actually using a term used by the prophet Mohammed when he called the building of a state the "grand Jihad".

When we pressed Arafat on why he is refusing to extradite known terrorists, including the Abu-Sita cousins, he deferred to his Security Minister, who responded that the Palestinians cannot turn over any suspects until there is evidence they committed an extraditable crime and then, only after receiving a court order authorizing the extradition.

EGYPT

That evening we flew to Cairo, where we met with Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak. We asked President Mubarak if he believes Arafat is doing all that he can do to combat terrorism, pursuant to the conditions established on receiving U.S. aid. He responded that Arafat is working practically and on the ground level to stop terrorism, and that forces such as Iran are the ones supporting Hamas and Jezbollah.

We also discussed our concerns about Saddam Hussein and the situation in Iraq. President Mubarak related that he has worked hard to try to influence Saddam to relinquish power and leave Iraq, including his offer to grant Saddam asylum in Egypt if Saddam promises to leave Iraq peacefully, but his efforts have not been successful.

BULGARIA

On September 1st, we departed Egypt en route to Sofia, Bulgaria, where we had meetings with the President of the National Assembly, Blagovest Sendov, and the President of Bulgaria, Zhelyu Zhelev. Both Mr. Sendov and Mr. Zhelev expressed an interest in NATO membership if the Parliament supports such membership, with Mr. Zhelev stating his firm desire that such membership should occur.

We also discussed at length the current situation in the former Yugoslavia, and its implications on Bulgaria. Finally, both Mr. Sendov and Mr. Zhelev discussed the importance of foreign investment in Bulgaria and U.S. support for Bulgaria's membership in the World Trade Organization and GATT.

BELGIUM

From Bulgaria, we travelled to Brussels, Belgium, where we were briefed by the U.S. representatives to NATO on the situation in Bosnia, including the recent bombing raids on Serbian positions. They advised us of the negotiations and cooperation between our NATO allies and the UN command in orchestrating the military operations after the Serbian mortar attack on Sarajevo. Significantly, they noted that these air strikes were focused on the Serb heavy weapon positions and on all lines of support for those weapons, including communication and control centers.

We also discussed the negotiation strategy for NATO, including the status of talks with Serbian strongman General Ratko Mladic. They expressed hope that these talks will be productive, although they noted that Mladic does not appear terribly cooperative. They also noted NATO's intention to proceed with the air strikes if Mladic and the Serbs do not remove their heavy weapons from around Sarajevo.

We returned to the United States on September 2, 1995.

U.S. SENATE,

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, August 28, 1995.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I think it important to call to your personal attention the substance of meetings which Senator Hank Brown and I have had in the last two days with Indian Prime Minister Rao and Pakistan Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto.

Prime Minister Rao stated that he would be very interested in negotiations which would lead to the elimination of any nuclear weapons on his subcontinent within ten or fifteen years including renouncing first use of such weapons. His interest in such negotiations with Pakistan would cover bilateral talks or a regional conference which would include the United States, China and Russia in addition to India and Pakistan.

When we mentioned this conversation to Prime Minister Bhutto this morning, she expressed great interest in such negotiations. When we told her of our conversation with Prime Minister Rao, she asked if we could get him to put that in writing.

When we asked Prime Minister Bhutto when she had last talked to Prime Minister Rao, she said that she had no conversations with him during her tenure as Prime Minister. Prime Minister Bhutto did say that she had initiated a contact through an intermediary but that was terminated when a new controversy arose between Pakistan and India.

From our conversations with Prime Minister Rao and Prime Minister Bhutto, it is my sense that both would be very responsive to discussions initiated and brokered by the United States as to nuclear weapons and also delivery missile system.

I am dictating this letter to you by telephone from Damascus as that you will have it at the earliest moment. I am also telefaxing a copy of this letter to Secretary of State Warren Christopher.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES AND
EDUCATION AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 1996

MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished majority leader and pursuant to the consent agreement, I move to proceed to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, H.R. 2127.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, at 10 a.m. there will be a 15-minute vote on a motion to proceed. If there are not 60 votes in the affirmative on the motion to proceed, there will then be a second vote at 11 a.m. on a motion to proceed. If there are not 60 votes on the second vote, the Senate will be recessed until later in the day to allow the Finance Committee to meet.

Remaining appropriations would be the State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill and the continuing resolution.

Therefore, according to the instruction of the distinguished majority leader, a late night session is expected with rollcall votes throughout the day.

Now I do move to proceed, on behalf of the majority leader, to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I spoke at some length yesterday afternoon on the import of this bill. It is my hope we would proceed to debate this bill. It is a very important piece of legislation, containing in excess of \$62 billion in discretionary appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. It contains an additional \$200.9 billion in nondiscretionary expenditures. It is within the 602(b) allocations given to the committee according to the Congressional Budget Office.

I, frankly, would have liked to have seen more funds allocated to our subcommittee so we could have had more for very vital services under this bill. As it was, the allocation to the Senate subcommittee was almost \$1.6 billion above the House of Representatives, and those additional funds were placed significantly in the education account.

With the cooperation of Senator HARKIN, with whom I have worked for many years—last year Senator HARKIN was chairman, I was ranking; this year our roles are reversed—we made the best allocation we could, assisted by very able and competent staff, allocating funds in a very, very complex bill.

We have maintained funding for Goals 2000, which is in response to a 1983 report about the shambles in education, where sufficient actions have still not been taken. These goals are voluntary on the States. The States can accept the Federal standards and

goals or can adopt standards and goals on their own as they choose.

We have made provision for LIHEAP, low-income fuel assistance, which goes principally to the elderly who are without sufficient funds to buy their fuel. It is really a proposition, as the expression goes, of heating or eating that plagues those individuals.

We have made allocation for funding for violence against women. With the House figure being at \$32 million on the shelter issue—the full authorization was \$50 million—in our subcommittee allocations, we have found the funding for the full \$50 million.

We have presented a bill which has taken care of key issues of plant safety. We have stripped the bill of provisions relating to legislation because of our conclusion that legislation ought not to be included on an appropriations bill, a policy adopted by the full committee as a general matter on all appropriation bills under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, Senator HATFIELD.

On biomedical research, Mr. President, we have for the National Institutes of Health nearly \$11.6 billion, an increase of some \$300 million over the fiscal year 1995 appropriations. These funds will boost the biomedical research appropriations to maintain and strengthen the tremendous strides which have been made in unlocking medical mysteries which lead to new treatments and cures. Gene therapy offers great promise for the future. In the 15 years that I have been in the Senate, all those years on the appropriations subcommittee dealing with health and human services, where cuts have been proposed by Presidents, both Democrat and Republican, we have increased funding for medical research, which I think it is very important.

Two years ago, I had a medical problem and was the beneficiary of the MRI developed in 1985, after I had come to the Senate, a life-saving procedure to detect an intracranial lesion. So I have professional, political, and personal experiences to attest to the importance of health research funding.

On Alzheimer's disease, Mr. President, this last year the United States spent over \$90 billion to care for Alzheimer's patients. This devastating disease robs its victims of their minds while depriving families of the well-being and security they deserve.

We have been working to focus more attention and more money into the causes and cures of Alzheimer's. To address this problem, the bill contains increased funding for research into finding the cause and cures for Alzheimer's disease. The bill also includes nearly \$5 million for a State grant program to